

**Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary**

Application No.

10/072,726

Applicant(s)

KUK ET AL.

Examiner

Carlos Lopez

Art Unit

1731

**All Participants:**(1) Carlos Lopez.(2) Paul Farrell.**Status of Application:** Pending

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 2 August 2004**Time:** 3pm**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1 and 7

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature) \_\_\_\_\_

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was noted to applicant that the body of the instant claims read on any tower and was not specifically drawn to an optical draw tower. Applicant thus agreed to amend claim 1 to include the limitation that the claimed optical draw tower comprised at least one of a preform feed unit, a furnace, a spinning nozzle, a diameter gauge, and a coating unit. The same changes to claim 7 were made and to further distinguish the preamble from the body of the claim.